

SEP 7 1983

ALEXANDER L STEVAS,  
CLERK

CASE NO. 83-156

UNITED STATES  
SUPREME COURT  
October Term, 1983

BOYD VEENKANT, per se,  
Petitioner,

- VS -

MAURICE N. BLAKE, et al., (1)  
GEORGE R. CORSIGLIA, et al., (2)  
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
FROM THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

REPLY BRIEF (Rule 22.5)  
ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BOYD VEENKANT, per se,  
P.O. BOX 115  
ALLEGAN, MI. 49010-0115  
(616) 673-4400

GEORGE H. WELLER,  
JOSEPH F. CHIESA,  
NOREEN L. SLANK,  
STEPHEN R. BERNSTEIN, (1).  
DOUGLAS E. KETCHUM,  
GEORGE H. WELLER. (2)

Of Counsel.

REPLY BRIEF (Rule 22.5)

All the Respondents but Blake and Farrell , Of counsel by Abe A. Achmier, under Rule of the Supreme Court of the United States, under Rule 22.1 or others have failed to file a Brif in Opposition.

The Respondents shall have 30 days in which to file 40 printed copies of an opposing brief disclosing any matter or ground why the cause should not be reviewed by the Court.

Petitioner doesn't know if Counsel for Blake and Farrell filed 40 copies with the Clerk and in addition must bear at its close the manuscript signature of counsel of record. The 40 copies fall under Rule 22.1. Further states, under Rule 28.3, if the document has been produced under Rule 33, three copies shall be served on each other party separately represented in the proceeding. Petitioner was not served three

copies as required under Rule 33 or signed by counsel under Rule 33.6.

Petitioner refers this Court to page iv of the BRIEF IN OPPOSITION, drafted by Abe A. Schmier as Counsel for Blake and Farrell. It states "conversion of a document which never existed".

Honorable Court, if you'll check this Plaintiff-Appellant's Appeal from U.S. District Court to the U.S. Court of Appeals on page 55, exhibit No. 16, you'll see a photo copy of this Motion for new trial, Dated Monday Oct. 5, 1970, being Atty. Starbuck's motion, being a photo copy taken from the receipt book on page 28, of what was advanced to Atty. Blake and Rabinowitz on April 28, 1976.

Further states, the total remarks stated on page iv ends with a question mark, to show doubt, uncertainty, as to the claim made being the truth.

Petitioner, Boyd Veenkant, per se, under 22.4 states, the expiration of the time allowed therefor, or express waiver of right to file, by Respondents has expired. Therefore under Rule 33.7, if the Court shall find the provisions of this Rule have not been adhered to, it may impose, in its discretion, appropriate sanctions including but not limited to dismissal of the action, imposition of costs, or disciplinary sanction upon counsel. Petitioner, Boyd Veenkant prays, that the Court finds the Respondents guilty and issue a judgment as asked, plus punitive and compensatory damages to curtail the unlawful practice ,plus all court cost and attorney fee's allowed under U.S. § 1983; Thank You:

Respectfully Submitted,  
By: Boyd Veenkant, per se,  
P.O. BOX 115  
ALLEGAN, Mi. 49010-0115  
(616) 673-4400

Dated: Aug. 24, 83.